

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheets attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figures 13, 18 and 20 are being presented as new formal drawing sheets to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheets. Figures 13, 18 and 20 have been amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) to reflect objections made by the Examiner under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 (p)(5). In Figure 18 the reference number 91 has been added. In Figure 20, item 94 has been relabeled as “known paths” to support the specification. In Figure 13, item 77 has been relabeled as “transformer” to support the specification.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 13, 17, 18 and 22 are currently being amended.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-22 remain pending in this application.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 18 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions for each respective claim objection to more clearly recite the invention.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should now be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-15, 17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0176489 in the name of Sriram *et al.* (hereinafter "Sriram"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Embodiments of the present invention relate to buffering methods and systems. As described in the specification, while conventional buffering methods are based on a clock signal from a master time, embodiments of the present invention allow a processor to not be synchronously clocked by the sample rate. In this regard, the processor is allowed to obtain data from sample buffers as needed. In accordance with embodiments of the present invention, a buffer is inputted conditional on the next buffer being inputted, as is clearly

noted by the processing and receiving steps into particular buffers recited in the claims. For example, claim 1 recites “receiving samples at a third buffer during the processing of the first group of symbols.” Independent claims 9, 10, 13, 17 and 22 each recite a similar feature.

By contrast, Sriram fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of the pending claims. First, the stated purpose of the input to the buffers in the disclosure of Sriram is to detect time changes for the correlator. As noted above, embodiments of the present invention are not provided for this purpose, but rather to allow a processor to not be synchronously clocked by the sample rate.

Further, while embodiments of the present invention provides that the previous buffer is inputted conditional on the next buffer being inputted, Sriram does not disclose that a specific buffer input is pointed to with each group of sample inputs. Instead, the cited portions of Sriram disclose the availability of two buffers, but do not specify any order or explicit instruction to which the buffers must be utilized nor if they must be utilized. Accordingly, Sriram fails to anticipate the pending claims.

Claims, 1, 9, 10, 13, 17 and 22 are patentable.

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14-15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of allowable claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 17 and 22. Claims 2-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14-15 are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sriram in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,140 in the name of Lee *et al.* (hereinafter “Lee”). The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sriram in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,527 in the name of Kim *et al.* (hereinafter “Kim”). The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sriram in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,307 in the name of Roohparvar (hereinafter “Roohparvar”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5, 8 and 16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from either allowable claim 1 or allowable claim 13 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

The Examiner rejected claim 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sriram in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0038633 in the name of Robertson *et al.* (hereinafter “Robertson”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 18 recites features similar to those noted above with reference to independent claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 17 and 22. As noted above, Sriram fails to teach or suggest this feature. Robertson fails to cure this deficiency of Sriram. Robertson is merely cited for its alleged disclosure of a buffer with five entries. Nowhere does Robertson teach or suggest the above-noted feature of the independent claims.

Accordingly, independent claim 18 is patentable. Claims 19-21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 18 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for

such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 20, 2007

By /G. Peter Albert Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268